DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 797 JC 750 151

AUTHOR Martorana, S. V.; And Others
TITLE CUPIR: Cooperative Utilization of Private Institutional Resources: A Multifaceted Thrust for the Private Junior Colleges.
INSTITUTION American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Oct 74
NOTE 70p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Academic Education; College Admission; College Cooperation; College Teachers; *Consortia; Cooperative Planning; Cooperative Programs; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Junior Colleges; Library Cooperation; *Private Colleges; *Shared Services; Student Enrollment

ABSTRACT

In 1973, 180 independent two-year colleges with membership in the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) were surveyed to determine the extent of cooperative arrangements. Forty-five colleges (25 percent) reported 207 programs of interinstitutional cooperation. In a second survey of state directors of public two-year colleges, 321 institutions reported a total of 328 programs. Overall, cooperating private colleges average four programs per institution, while cooperating public colleges average 0.9 programs per institution. For both kinds of institutions, approximately 50 percent of all programs are academic. Library, faculty, and admissions and enrollment programs comprise other important areas for the independents. Training and admissions and enrollment programs are the other important areas for public institutions. Public college programs usually involve several institutions; independent college programs usually involve only two institutions. Both public and private colleges tend to cooperate with their two- or four-year counterparts. Cooperative programs are seen as a means of strengthening private two-year colleges without loss of autonomy, through sharing of resources in a time of fiscal uncer*ainty. (Author/DC)

ED101797

CUPIR: Cooperative Utilization of Private Institutional Resources: A Multifaceted Thrust for the Private Junior Colleges

S. V. Martorana
Eileen P. Kuhns
Richard M. Witter
Alan J. Sturtz

A joint publication of the
Center for the Study of
Higher Education,
The Pennsylvania State University,
and the
American Association of
Community and Junior Colleges

The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

October 1974

JC 750 151

CONTENTS

List of Tables v

Foreword vii

I. From Problems to Potential: Can the Private Junior Colleges Shift? 1

Interinstitutional Cooperation 2

Plight of the Private Colleges 5

II. Birth of the CUPIR Project 9

III. Field Perspectives on Interinstitutional Cooperation 12

The Independent Junior College Perspective 13

The Public Community College Perspective 30

Summary and Discussion of Survey Findings 50

IV. Moving Ahead 53

Appendix A: CUPIR Planning Group 55

Appendix B: CUPIR Task Force 57

References 59

LIST OF TABLES

Independent Two-Year College Tables

1	Number of Two-Year Private Colleges Responding by Region	14
2	Interinstitutional Cooperative Programs at Private Two-Year Colleges	15
3	Educational Resources Used in Cooperative Programs	16
4	Other Community Resources Used in Cooperative Programs	18
5	Strengths Contributed to Cooperative Programs	20
6	Advantages of Cooperative Programs	21
7	Disadvantages of Cooperative Programs	22
8	State of Development of Cooperative Programs	24
9	Future Cooperative Programs	24
10	Strengths Projected for Future Cooperative Programs	26
11	Advantages Projected for Future Cooperative Programs	27
12	State of Readiness of Future Cooperative Programs	28

Public Two-Year College Tables

13	Interinstitutional Cooperative Programs for Public Two-Year Colleges by Region	31
14	Interinstitutional Cooperative Programs for Public Two-Year Colleges	32
15	Educational Resources Used in Cooperative Programs	34
16	Community Resources Used in Cooperative Programs	36
17	Number of Educational Resources Used in Cooperative Programs	37
18	Patterns of Cooperative Relationships	39
19	Percentage of Total Programs and Bilateral Programs in Each Category	39

20	Strengths Contributed to Cooperative Programs	41
21	Advantages of Cooperative Programs	43
22	State of Development of Cooperative Programs	45
23	Strengths Projected for Future Cooperative Programs	46
24	Advantages Projected for Future Cooperative Programs	48
25	State of Readiness of Future Cooperative Programs	49

FOREWORD

The Center for the Study of Higher Education and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges are pleased to share in the joint publication of the results of the CUPIR study as we have shared in the project itself. This cooperation is an example, we feel, of a way in which university-based centers and associations can work together to aid postsecondary educational institutions, both public and private.

S. V. Martorana, who is professor of higher education and research associate at the Center, led the task force of the project; the center gave research assistant support; the association gave staff commitment through Eileen Kuhns, the executive associate for council development, and Richard M. Witter, director of the National Council of Independent Junior Colleges; state directors of community and junior colleges and institutions provided the information which forms the basis of this report. To the persons listed among the original planning group and the AACJC task force for the CUPIR project must go the primary credit for its initial emergence and ultimate completion.

Institutional cooperation is certainly one of the most important postsecondary educational issues of the seventies; the plight of the private colleges is equally important. CUPIR has attempted to establish a base from which some further action can be taken at the national level to join these two issues which seem so vital to the postsecondary enterprise at a time when it is being pressed simultaneously for more and better programs and services and for financial retrenchment.

We hope that the cooperative effort represented by this publication and by the programs reported in the document will continue, grow, and attract greater support from the public and especially from private foundations and other auspices concerned for continued maintenance of a strong postsecondary education program in this country.

G. Lester Anderson CSHE
Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. AACJC

I. FROM PROBLEMS TO POTENTIAL: CAN THE PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES SHIFT?

The "community college movement" in the United States, which in recent years has gained considerable prominence and recognition as a strong and significant new departure in the nation's formal educational structure, was largely private during its early years. When the movement had sustained its first birth pains and demonstrated to educational and other observers that it was here to stay, its stability was manifested by the organization of the American Association of Junior Colleges in St. Louis in 1920. The large majority of the institutions represented—about two-thirds of the total—were private junior colleges. Not until after World War II, when so many students returned to college under the first GI Bill and postsecondary education expanded rapidly, did the number of public institutions exceed the number of private institutions.

Following the boom in postsecondary education which took place in the late fifties and early sixties, however, the private junior colleges, along with their sister four-year colleges and universities operating under private sponsorship, encountered growing operating difficulties. Costs increased dramatically as enrollments moved toward stabilization and, in many cases, even began to decline. In the fall of 1972, the number of these institutions left comprised only about a fourth of the total number of institutions reported in the Association's Directory.

Some argue that this decline of the private junior colleges must lead inevitably toward greater diminution and perhaps ultimate oblivion. Others contend, however, that the private junior colleges do, in fact, have considerable resources to support a significant role in postsecondary education and, furthermore, that the particular kinds of educational services they provide should be preserved in the public interest. That the latter position may in fact have a substantial validity was demonstrated, at least in part, during the life of the "Developing Colleges Project" which was conducted by the American Association of Junior Colleges from 1969 to 1972 under the provision and with the financial support of Title III of the Education Professional Development Act. This program encouraged and assisted institutions to group together into state and regional consortia which collectively

could provide both expanded and improved postsecondary educational services to their constituencies.

The point of significance here is that this three-year period provided opportunity to observe the potentiality of cooperative interinstitutional consortia. It made it possible to assess the availability and willingness of a large number of public and private junior colleges to participate in what seemed to be a means to better total service to the postsecondary educational needs of the nation. Out of this experience came the germ of the idea which led ultimately to the CUPIR (Cooperative Utilization of Private Institutional Resources) project of the Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the National Council of Independent Junior Colleges. The results of that project comprise the content of this monograph.

As a background to the more detailed description of the development of the CUPIR project and its outcomes, this section is devoted to providing a larger review of the two recent developments in postsecondary education on which CUPIR rests: interinstitutional cooperation and the plight of the private colleges. They may appear at first to be discrepant and quite different. A review of the discussion they each have attracted in the widespread discussion of postsecondary education during recent years, however, may make it possible to identify the interrelationships which have already occurred and indicate some of the potentialities on which the CUPIR project is placing its hopes.

Interinstitutional Cooperation

Junior and community colleges, like higher educational institutions in general, have traditionally "gone it alone." Throughout most of the history of higher education, this practice prevailed and "competition rather than cooperation has been the order of the day... Each institution . . . [has] its own peculiar and cherished qualities and no one [wants] to alter its distinctive identity. Each has pardonable pride in its own achievements, both past and present" (Proceedings, 1962, p. 5). The traditional approaches are under reexamination, however, because all colleges are confronted today with the dilemma of strong demands for the improvement and/or the expansion of existing programs and services in the face of rising costs. As long ago as 1961, the impending difficulties of reconciling worthwhile contributions to so-

ciety with the increasing limitation of finances, material, and personnel resources and facilities on the other was noted by Martorana, Messersmith, and Nelson (p. 1). The institution operating singly was finding it more and exceedingly difficult to cope.

Within the past two decades, postsecondary institutions of all types have moved toward interinstitutional cooperative approaches to deal with problems they perceive as both common and formidable (Johnson, 1966, pp. 1-2). Although called by various names, such as consortium, the goal is joint effort toward mutually advantageous goals without sacrifice of large measures of individual autonomy. Interinstitutional cooperation requires an agreement whereby two or more institutions agree to strengthen academic programs, improve administration, or provide other special services (Moore, 1968, p. 4) not only for members of participating institutions but also for the public as a whole in the local, state, regional, national, and international spheres (Donovan, 1965, pp. 3-4). Some also look upon it as a compensatory development which will balance the external forces of change and render some order to institutional operations (Patterson, 1970, p. 2).

Basically, higher educational institutions join in two major forms of cooperative arrangements: interstate compacts statutorily or otherwise officially endorsed and voluntary associations. The first type, illustrated by WICHE and SREB, joins public and private institutions by virtue of agreements ratified by state legislatures, and is usually limited to predetermined regional boundaries (Salwak, 1968, p. 491; Patterson, 1971, p. 19). The voluntary associations operate through joint contracts or special charters and generally consist of public or private institutions or a combination of both. Cooperative groupings typically are established solely through mutual consent of the participating institutions. They operate with limited central staffs to whom only specific functions are delegated. The arrangement can be limited to metropolitan areas, straddle state lines, or establish any regional boundaries that support the cooperative purpose (Johnson, p. 2; Salwak, p. 492; Patterson, p. 19). Representative of this type of voluntary, almost federated, venture are the Committee on Interinstitutional Cooperation (CIC), the Claremont Colleges (California), the Great Lakes Colleges Association, and the Five College Cooperative (Massachusetts).

Although the search for them was extensive, no comparable illustrative voluntary interinstitutional associations comprised solely of community or junior colleges was found to have existed prior to 1965.

The stimulus and support of the Developing Colleges Program of the late 1960s, however, generated some beginnings in this direction. Under other stimuli, a number of groupings such as the League for Innovation have emerged and should be noted.

The most recently available information shows that there are now some interinstitutional structures of colleges of all types in operation (Patterson, 1973). It is generally agreed, however, that despite the growth, the state of the art of voluntary interinstitutional cooperation can still only be described as primitive (Patterson, p. 22; Wood, 1971, pp. 242-43). Although there is strong indication that instances of interinstitutional cooperation are expanding rapidly in number and complexity and, therefore, evidently gaining greater public and private support, "it is not yet clear whether there is anything more than a vague awareness, in either the nondeveloping or developing institution, of the *quid pro quo* potential of substantive interinstitutional cooperation" (Donovan, p. 14; Davis, 1967, p. 349; Patterson, p. 9).

The substantive concerns to which consortia are addressed include a wide range of topics. An Office of Education study by Moore indicated that the major areas of cooperation in 1965-66 were (1) academic and professional, involving planning, development, and administration and accounting for 90 percent of all arrangements; (2) administration and development, including regional boards and special resource centers; and (3) special purpose informational arrangements (Moore, pp. 7; 10). Despite this seemingly channeled activity, Sanford, in a much earlier study on cooperative arrangements, noted that almost without exception agreements had been developed in response to particular situations (1934, p. 13). Davis pointed to two prevailing foci of interest, one involving matters largely tangential to the central interests of the institution and involving relatively little commitment; and another touching the "mission" and "academic heart" of the institution. Unfortunately, both Johnson (1966) and Davis (1967) found most cooperation to be in the category of tangential rather than fundamental concerns (Johnson, p. 5; Davis, p. 349).

As already noted, the role of the federal government became very influential during the 1960s and generated the first seeds of the CUPIR idea. Title III of the EPDA led to the Program for Developing Colleges and a truly nationally coordinated effort in interinstitutional reinforcement of two-year colleges between and among themselves took shape. The Higher Education Facilities Act (1963), the Higher Education Act (1965), and the International Education Act (1966)

stimulated such cooperation by providing planning, development, and implementation of cooperative arrangements which showed promise for strengthening academic programs and administration of developing institutions (Davis, p. 348; Moore, pp. 1-2). Later amendments to the Higher Education Act (1968; 1972) continued to support the concept.

The principle inherent in all interinstitutional cooperation is the collective marshaling of strengths and resources to provide a better capability to achieve mutually established goals. The private junior colleges seek in common to fulfill the potential of service to the society that is possible because of the strengths of their resources—faculties, facilities, instructional materials, and, most importantly, institutional ideals of service. That this goal is currently under real and severe threat is strongly in evidence.

Plight of the Private Colleges

Most recent surveys of American higher education indicate that private institutions are educating a smaller and smaller percentage of students. The results of these cumulative studies and numerous statements in the popular press indicate that private higher education is fighting for its life. Some colleges have closed and others may not survive. Such evidence, however, should not cause a premature and unduly negative conclusion. Private institutions differ widely; to predict disaster for all would be a great disservice. Just as some of the private universities like Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, Chicago, Stanford are holding their own despite the recent difficulties of private institutions, so will the worth of some private junior colleges like Alice Lloyd College, Keystone Junior College, Central YMCA Community College, and others continue to be recognized. The national contributions they make should assure their support and survival.

The problem of survival appears most crucial for the liberal arts colleges with national orientation and for the private two-year college. Both suffer from financial difficulties caused by an economic recession, continuous inflation, and the current general public disillusionment with higher education. Both face declining enrollments caused by slow institutional responses to changing societal needs and the competition of public institutions (MacKay, 1968; Raper, 1968; Geiger, 1971; Roueche, 1971).

The 1970s hold an uncertain future for private junior colleges. Low endowments and operating funds derived almost exclusively from tuition catch such institutions in "a merciless squeeze between rising costs and noncompetitive prices" (Garrison, 1969, p. 35; Roueche, pp. 1-2). Although private junior colleges at one time accounted for about 20 percent of the 1,100 colleges reporting to an American Association of Junior Colleges' survey (Connor, 1971, p. 24), the number of private junior colleges declined over the past decade while the number of public community colleges doubled. In 1961, 26 percent of the junior college enrollment came from the private sector; in 1969 it was 7 percent (Roueche, pp. 4-5).

Private colleges are supported mainly by tuition and fees, with income from endowments and private gifts making up the difference. In 1971-72, 51 percent of current fund income of private two-year colleges came from tuition and fees (USOE, 1970, pp. 120; 129). However, the widening dollar gap between income and outgo is seen as the growing weakness of the private institutions (Kinnison, 1969, p. 269). Institutions are just making out with stopgap measures of raising tuition, cutting back on maintenance and equipment, and intensifying fund-raising efforts.

It has been postulated that money problems are only a symptom of a more basic problem, namely, institutional rigidity and intense insistence upon autonomy. Money, it is claimed, is available for colleges which will adequately meet the needs of students, serve their community, and have good administrative leadership (Raper, p. 21; Kinnison, p. 268). Private colleges may be making a great public relations error in portraying themselves as teetering on the brink of disaster and may eventually fall victims to a self-fulfilling prophecy (Kinnison, p. 268). Geiger points out that no prestigious or even "good" institution has had to close or appears likely to do so in the immediate future (p. 501). Kinnison also provides some not too discouraging statistics: there have been 115 closures and 82 mergers in the twenty-year period between 1945 and 1965, an average of 11 per year. This is far less than the 200-600 "casualties" in a decade which he says one source predicted (p. 267). Both Kinnison (p. 270) and Geiger agree that closure generally happens to "tiny, underfinanced sectarian institutions dependent on loyal and nonmobile faculty and a student body recruited locally or by a supporting church" (p. 501). Over half of the terminal listings in the past 25 years involved junior colleges with narrow and traditional offerings.

Many steps have been suggested to counteract the negative trends. Essentially they urge colleges to make their resources and capabilities work for them to obtain financia balance and stronger enrollments. The suggestions also emphasize that certain features and traits have been the strength of these institutions. The task, therefore, is to reaffirm these distinctive qualities (Geiger, p. 501; Hughes, 1972, p. 241; Eddy, 1973, p. 27). Striving for excellence, however need not entail exclusive admissions, a classical curriculum, and unrealistic grading practices. What is needed, whether for excellence or survival, are greater focus on student needs and the design of programs to meet them (Raper, p. 22; Eddy, p. 28).

Concerning financial operations, similar suggestions appear. The college needs to be no more overtly efficient than art, literature, music, or the family, Commager contends; it can remain small, simple, and relatively unorganized and uncomputerized (Commager, 1970, p. 64). It should take an honest look at its own values and place money where the values lie: "Each time a college seeks preservation on the basis that it has no resources to change, it dies a little" (Eddy, p. 28). Concerning moves to better enrollments, the private college must clarify and reaffirm a commitment to distinctive qualities which have been areas of strength and not let these be watered down. Growth must be directed at maintaining strength of program: new majors and their costs should only be added when it is clear they will be self-supporting (Hughes, pp. 242-43). Commager maintains that private colleges should offer qualitative preparation for future goals (p. 63).

There is growing acceptance that private junior colleges cannot expect public sympathy for their economic plight unless they are willing to commit themselves to meeting broader social needs. Interinstitutional consortia could possibly contribute such a service. One possible benefit of this arrangement might be in programs for nontransfer students in two-year colleges. Although the two-year college has a transfer function, many students do not transfer. A public service would be rendered to these students—some of whom might otherwise drop out—by providing more suitable programs (Raper, p. 22). Such a benefit might reduce attrition in private two-year institutions.

Repeated observations can be noted of the possibilities for financial savings and stabilization of institutional existence through use of better management techniques. These call for closer reviews of internal organization; chain of command; regular, systematic evaluations

of staff functions, administration, and other procedures; and the effective use of personnel or facilities (Garrison, p. 36).

The solutions for the plight of the private junior college, then, generally parallel those advocated for private higher education as a whole. The viability of these institutions lies in their diversity, in their ability to adapt to changing patterns of education, and especially in their resistance to becoming like any other institution. They must redevelop their particular strengths and capitalize upon them through innovative programs which will attract outside financial support, public attention, and, most importantly, interested students. Above all else, the product must be made worth the money paid to obtain it. Achievement of all of these objectives seems more enhanced by interinstitutional cooperative efforts than by colleges seeking to go it alone.

II. BIRTH OF THE CUPIR PROJECT

The forces that prompted the two national surveys reported here and engendered a continuing plan of action operated for over five years before the concerted design to draw private and public two-year colleges together began to take shape. As far back as 1968, the privately controlled junior colleges were actively expressing the need for some collective action on their part to attract more attention to their role in American postsecondary education and to the resources they possessed to support that role.

With the assistance of a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the American Association of Junior Colleges, in 1968, commissioned a study under the direction of Kenneth MacKay, then President of Union College in New Jersey, "to identify and report the concerns, problems, issues, needs, and plans of nonpublic two-year colleges in America" and "to identify and describe some outstanding or representative examples of innovation and experimentation in these colleges as they respond to the rapid changes which affect all higher education as this decade concludes" (MacKay, 1968, p. 1).

Individual attention given to students and the freedom to be flexible and experimental within a relatively short time frame were the two advantages of independent two-year colleges mentioned most often by the MacKay respondents, who were administrators and faculty within the institutions. The two chief issues or problems identified were adequate financing and understaffing, the latter referring primarily to "recruiting and retaining competent faculty" (MacKay, 1968, p. 32).

One of the results of the MacKay report was the formation of the National Council of Independent Junior Colleges at Sullins College in November 1969. Implementing the recommendations of the MacKay study was one of the goals of the council. An affiliate of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the NCIJC has been quite successful in this, although its special membership fees have produced only modest resources.

The council persisted in its efforts to give new energy to the drive of the private two-year colleges to prove their worth in American postsecondary education. In response to their efforts, the AACJC board of directors in August 1972 requested formulation of a planning group from among the private two-year college leadership to examine

various ways to strengthen the efforts which the independent junior colleges were making on their own behalf and to enhance their relationships with the public colleges. The planning group, with representatives from both private and public two-year colleges, as well as from the public at large, met in September and October 1972. (See Appendix A for a list of the membership.) Following their deliberations, the planning group recommended the establishment of a special AACJC task force with a charge to include, but not to be limited to, a nine-point thrust: development of a data base; assessment of needs; cooperative endeavors; regionalism and consortia; alternative learning strategies; public relations, admissions, and retention; financial management; trustee participation; articulation; and development of a national pool of consultants. Upon the recommendation of the association's president, the AACJC board of directors approved establishment of such a task force with membership as listed in Appendix B.

At the outset of its deliberations, however, the task force realized that no realistic frontal attack on all of the nine points established in the charge of the earlier planning group (important as each of these clearly are) could be made in its one-year projected lifetime. Much of the first meeting on March 15, 1973, was devoted to delimiting the task force to the most feasible and promising line of action.

The task force decided that the third of the nine thrusts depicted in their charge was most likely to produce positive results within the year of working time, given the association and council resources available to help the task force in its work. Accordingly, the task force concentrated its late spring and late summer meetings on the goal of establishing, first, a better base of knowledge concerning consortia or interinstitutional cooperative arrangements and, then, an action program to accelerate, expand, and strengthen such arrangements with special attention to the possibilities these consortia-type developments have for private, independent junior colleges.

The decision was based on the belief of the task force that there are indeed many varied resources in the private, independent two-year colleges which can be used positively for the society. These include more than the obvious ones of buildings, library and other instructional resources, and specialized faculty. They also include such intangible but important resources as institutional individuality and creativity and the loyalty and support of specialized clienteles.

That this decision was well directed is evident from many perspectives. One is the fact that all colleges and universities today are

under great pressure to join forces in serving the society rather than stressing unilateral or possibly wasteful duplicative or competitive actions. Another is that friends and supporters of postsecondary institutions advocate such action as being timely, efficient, and judicious. At a recent address to a conference of postsecondary educators in Washington, D.C., Congressman O'Hara, chairman of the House of Representatives' Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, advised the use of regional groupings and consortia as a means of guaranteeing full use by the society of all available resources for postsecondary education—private and public.

III. FIELD PERSPECTIVES ON INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

This monograph reports the results of the first effort of the task force appointed by the AACJC at the request of the National Council of Independent Junior Colleges following deliberations in the late fall of 1972. The task force sought to provide a better base of understanding about interinstitutional arrangements involving private, independent two-year colleges through two national surveys. One survey was sent to the 180 private two-year colleges holding membership in the AACJC; the other was sent to the state directors of community colleges in forty-eight states. The survey asked administrators to indicate what interinstitutional cooperative programs they were engaged in and with whom, the strengths they brought to the program, the advantages and disadvantages of the arrangement, and what plans, if any, were projected for the future.

Major categories for cooperative programs used in this survey were adapted from *Putting Cooperation to Work*, a 1972 publication of the Academy for Educational Development. The sample list of interinstitutional cooperative programs mailed to the state directors with each survey form included examples under the following categories: administrative and business services; admissions and enrollment; academic (including use of facilities for such programs); libraries; student services; and faculty. A seventh category, training, was added during content analysis of the survey returns.

Training programs referred to projects conducted by groups of institutions to provide personnel with opportunities and services for advancement in particular professional or occupational career lines in business, industry, or the professions. Under such arrangements two-year colleges cooperate with other two-year, four-year, or other types of educational community resources to provide (1) richer and expanded two-year college programs not available from any one institution, (2) articulated lower- and upper-division programs leading to baccalaureate professional qualification (nursing, engineering, teaching), or (3) other forms of extended specialty development. Such projects sometimes included programs for the in-service improvement of the faculty of the cooperating two-year colleges themselves. This latter type of project was included in this category instead of in the "faculty

program" category which was restricted to use for cooperative arrangements in which the two-year college faculty were specifically cited as the agency resource for the training of others and were not subjects of the program themselves.

The Independent Junior College Perspective

Of the 180 private two-year colleges holding membership in the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, forty-five colleges in 24 states and one overseas country responded with usable information to the "Survey of Involvement in and Readiness for Interinstitutional Cooperation." Six additional colleges responded but reported no current interinstitutional programs. Of the 45 usable responses, 19 were from independent (no church affiliation) colleges; the remaining 26 were church-related. Table 1 shows the responses by region.

The 45 independent colleges which responded positively to the survey reported a total of 207 various types of interinstitutional cooperative programs. The programs break down into the seven categories mentioned in Table 2. The private two-year colleges are presently conducting cooperative programs aimed at improving or enlarging the academic (programs, library, faculty) sector of the institutions and at the ever-present problem of admissions and recruitment of students. Academic programs accounted for almost half (47.8%) of the cooperative ventures currently underway, while another 33 percent were in the areas of library programs (13.0%), faculty programs (10.6%), and admissions and enrollment (10.1%). At the present time there is minimal effort being made to engage in cooperative training programs.

The majority of the cooperative efforts are bilateral in nature. However, there are a number of consortium arrangements with three to six institutions; some consortia have as many as 18, 19, and 26 institutions. Ten of the colleges indicated involvement in consortia funded with Title III (USOE) funds. Two colleges indicated their involvement in the 4-1-4 Conference (now the Association for Innovation in Higher Education). Most of the cooperative arrangements appear to be informal with no written policies and procedures, although additional research would be necessary to accurately determine that.

Most of the colleges which responded appeared to have been involved in cooperative programs only within the last five years or so.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF TWO-YEAR PRIVATE COLLEGES RESPONDING BY REGION

REGION	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	REGIONAL TOTAL
Pacific Coast & Far West		
Oregon	1	1
Rocky Mountain		
Montana	4	
Wyoming	1	5
North Central		
Illinois	4	
Iowa	1	
Kansas	3	
Kentucky	3	
West Virginia	1	12
South and Southeast		
Alabama	1	
Georgia	1	
Louisiana	1	
Mississippi	1	
Missouri	1	
North Carolina	4	
Tennessee	2	
Texas	2	
Virginia	1	14
Mid-Atlantic		
Delaware	1	
Maryland	1	
New Jersey	1	
New York	5	
Pennsylvania	2	10
New England		
Vermont	1	
Maine	1	2
Foreign Country		
France	1	1
Total	45	45

A few colleges did say they had been involved in cooperative arrangements of eight, nine, and ten years. Several said the 1972-73 school year was the first year of cooperative effort and some said they were still in planning stages.

TABLE 2

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS AT PRIVATE TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

TYPE OF PROGRAM	TOTAL NO. OF PROGRAMS	PERCENTAGE
Administrative & Business Services	13	6.3
Admissions & Enrollment	21	10.1
Academic	99	47.8
Library	27	13.0
Training	7	3.4
Student Services	18	8.7
Faculty	22	10.6
Total	207	100.0

Educational Resources Utilized

Table 3 indicates the community educational resources participating in cooperative programs.

Two important trends with respect to the private two-year college are worthy of mention. First of all, the private two-year colleges cooperate with other two-year private institutions more than with any other type of formal educational institution. Almost 40 percent (38.6%) of the total number of educational resources involved in cooperative programs with private two-year colleges are other private two-year colleges. This is true for each of the major program categories. Secondly, the private two-year colleges turn to four-year institutions, both private and public, for cooperation before they turn to public two-year colleges. The second largest number of educational resources used in the 207 interinstitutional cooperative arrangements is 104 private four-year colleges, or just a little more than 20 percent of total resources (513) used. Public four-year institutions make up 15 percent of the cases; public two-year colleges only 12.5 percent.

For each major program category there are listed below in descending order the first four types of educational resources with which the private two-year colleges most often cooperated:

Administrative and Business Service
- Private two-year colleges
- Private four-year colleges
- Public two-year colleges
- Public four-year colleges

TABLE 3

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES USED IN COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES*										TOTAL NO. OF RESOURCES	ROW PERCENTAGE
	Pub Sec	Pr Sec	Pub 2 yr	Pr 2 yr	Pub 4 yr	Pr 4 yr	Prop Sch	B&I	CR	Govt		
Administrative & Business Services	1	1	3	12	2	7	1	1	–	1	29	5.6
Admissions & Enrollment	–	1	6	19	14	10	2	–	–	1	53	10.3
Academic	2	–	25	99	32	48	14	11	1	5	237	46.2
Library	2	1	16	25	14	16	9	–	–	2	85	16.6
Training	–	–	–	6	2	1	3	1	–	1	14	2.7
Student Services	2	1	5	18	7	12	2	–	–	1	48	9.4
Faculty	–	–	9	19	6	10	2	–	–	1	47	9.2
Total	7	4	64	198	77	104	33	13	1	12	513	100.0
Column Percentage	1.4	0.8	12.5	38.6	15.0	20.3	6.4	2.5	0.2	2.3	100.0	

*The key to the last four resources listed:

Prop Proprietary School
B&I Business and Industry
CR Community Resources
Govt Government: Federal, State, Local, and Quasi-Governmental

Admissions and Enrollment
- Private two-year colleges
- Public four-year colleges
- Private four-year colleges
- Public four-year colleges

Academic Programs
- Private two-year colleges
- Private four-year colleges
- Public four-year colleges
- Public two-year colleges

Library Programs
- Private two-year colleges
- Private four-year colleges
- Public two-year colleges
- Public four-year colleges

Student Services
- Private two-year colleges
- Private four-year colleges
- Public four-year colleges
- Public two-year colleges

Faculty Programs
- Private two-year colleges
- Private four-year colleges
- Public two-year colleges
- Public four-year colleges

Training Programs
- Private two-year colleges
- Community resources
- Public four-year colleges
- Three-way tie with private four-year colleges, business & industry, and governmental agencies

As can be readily seen, in six of the seven program categories the four types of postsecondary educational institutions listed above were most often the partners in interinstitutional cooperative programs.

Community Resources

It is refreshing and enlightening to see that in the training program area community resources rank second only to the private two-year colleges and that business, industry, and governmental agencies were involved to the same extent as higher education institutions. One of the things we hoped to determine from the survey was whether

TABLE 4

OTHER COMMUNITY RESOURCES USED IN COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	COMMUNITY RESOURCES*							TOTAL NO. OF RESOURCES	ROW PERCENTAGES
	Lb	Hp	Ms	Or	UC	RO	Bk		
Administrative & Business Services	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	1.2
Admissions & Enrollment	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	1.2
Academic	–	16	2	–	2	1	–	21	25.6
Library	8	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	9.8
Training	–	49	–	–	–	–	–	49	59.8
Student Services	–	–	–	1	1	–	–	2	2.4
Faculty	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0	0.0
Total	8	66	2	1	3	1	1	82	100.0
Column Percentage	9.8	80.5	2.4	1.2	3.7	1.2	1.2	100.0	

*Key to Abbreviations

Lb Libraries
Hp Hospitals
Ms Museums
Or Bands, choirs, orchestras, etc.
UC Urban centers
RO Religious organizations
Bk Banks

or not the colleges are cooperating with other community organizations and agencies to provide increased educational opportunity for students. The survey results as listed in Table 4 clearly tell us that the colleges are doing just that. The private colleges are not just involved in interinstitutional cooperative programs with other formal educational institutions, such as schools, colleges, and universities—they are cooperating with such agencies as libraries, hospitals, and other allied health agencies, museums, religious organizations, business and industry, proprietary institutions, governmental agencies, and other kinds of special community resources. Table 4 shows that about 11 percent of the resources being used in interinstitutional programs are made up of business and industry, proprietary schools, governmental agencies, and general community resources.

Table 4 shows an analysis of other community resources being used in interinstitutional ventures. A total of 82 of these community resources are involved in 207 cooperative programs. Hospitals and other allied health agencies represent the largest percentage of all such the cooperating agencies (80.5%). This is no doubt due to the recent upsurge in various kinds of allied health programs at the colleges. There is cooperation with other types of general community agencies and organizations, but to a much lesser degree.

With respect to Table 4, it should be pointed out that these data now are small and apparently not significant because there is not an initial datum point from which to measure change. If, five years ago, *no* such cooperative arrangements existed, then these figures do become very significant. However, these data can now help us establish trends for future studies.

Institutional Strengths

Table 5 provides the detailed analysis of the various strengths the institutions contributed to the cooperative arrangement.

Instructional resources (28.7%), personnel (26.1%), and timeliness (18.1%) account for almost 75 percent of all strengths mentioned in the 207 programs. Just a little more than 50 percent of the strengths are in academic programs. (Among these independent junior colleges only two mentioned autonomy as a strength brought to an interinstitutional cooperative arrangement.)

It is interesting to point out that while in the public sector 20 states reporting 328 programs of interinstitutional cooperation only indicated 292 strengths, 46 private colleges reporting 207 programs indicated 376 strengths. There are almost two strengths for each program as compared to not even one strength per program for the public colleges.

Institutional Advantages

The colleges were asked to cite advantages and disadvantages, if any, of the interinstitutional cooperative programs. Our content analysis determined that the advantages might best be classified into faculty resources, academic management, administrative management, economic measures, fiscal support, physical plant, and student services (Table 6).

TABLE 5

STRENGTHS CONTRIBUTED TO COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	STRENGTHS*								TOTAL NO. OF STRENGTHS	ROW PERCENTAGE
	PP	Eq	IR	RN	Pn	SS	Aut	EM		
Administrative & Business Services	–	2	4	5	9	–	1	3	24	6.4
Admissions & Enrollment	4	2	15	4	8	4	–	–	37	9.8
Academic	13	5	56	37	46	20	1	11	189	50.3
Library	13	–	12	6	7	1	–	2	41	10.9
Training	1	–	5	2	4	3	–	–	15	4.0
Student Services	1	–	6	5	7	5	–	–	24	6.4
Faculty	4	2	10	9	17	2	–	2	46	12.2
Total	36	11	108	68	98	35	2	18	376	100.0
Column Percentage	9.6	2.9	28.7	18.1	26.1	9.3	0.5	4.8	100.0	

*Key to Abbreviations:

PP	Physical Plant	Pn	Personnel
Eq	Equipment	SS	Student Services
IR	Instructional Resources	Aut	Autonomy
RN	Recognized need, timeliness	EM	Economizing Measures

TABLE 6

ADVANTAGES OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	ADVANTAGES							TOTAL NO. OF ADVANTAGES	ROW PERCENTAGE
	FR	AcM	AdM	EM	FS	PP	SS		
Administrative & Business Services	2	3	8	9	2	1	3	28	7.1
Admissions & Enrollment	1	5	5	14	1	2	12	40	10.2
Academic	11	37	27	40	13	13	60	201	51.3
Library	3	8	6	8	–	7	11	43	10.9
Training	2	2	3	1	2	1	7	18	4.6
Student Services	1	2	1	9	1	1	8	23	5.9
Faculty	12	2	6	8	2	1	8	39	10.0
Total	32	59	56	89	21	26	109	392	100.0
Column Percentage	8.2	15.0	14.3	12.7	5.4	6.6	27.8		

A total of 392 advantages were mentioned. The advantage cited most often by the private two-year colleges was that of student services (27.8%), an advantage often touted by these colleges as one of their significant contributions. The colleges are apparently enjoying economic advantages from cooperation since economic measures ranked second in number of citations as an advantage, in 22.7 percent of the cases.

Again, a little more than 50 percent of the advantages were found in the academic programs. The program areas of admissions and enrollment, library, and faculty programs had almost exactly the same percentage of advantages cited, namely 10.2 percent, 10.9 percent, and 10.0 percent respectively.

Institutional Disadvantages

Disadvantages mentioned by the survey participants were classified as program quality, faculty, coordination, cooperation, and finances (Table 7). A total of 79 disadvantages were discovered with coordination and cooperation almost equal to one another in the number of times they were mentioned, 37.9 percent and 34.2 percent respectively. The faculty category was not mentioned at all as a disadvantage by the independent junior colleges.

TABLE 7

DISADVANTAGES OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	DISADVANTAGES					TOTAL NO. OF DISADVANTAGES	ROW PERCENTAGE
	PQ	Fac	Cr	Cp	Fi		
Administrative & Business Services	–	–	5	2	2	12	15.2
Admissions & Enrollment	–	–	3	4	3	10	12.7
Academic	5	–	17	11	5	38	48.1
Library	1	–	–	4	2	7	8.8
Training	–	–	1	–	–	1	1.3
Student Services	–	–	1	2	1	4	5.1
Faculty	2	–	–	4	1	7	8.8
Total	8	–	27	30	14	79	100.0
Column Percentage	10.1	0	34.2	38.9	17.7		

Nearly 50 percent of the disadvantages fell in the academic programs area, with the administration and business and admissions and enrollment areas ranking second and third respectively with 15.2 percent and 12.7 percent of the disadvantages. I think it is unusual, and yet a testament to the ingenuity and perseverance of colleges that want to cooperate with one another for some particular purpose, that finances were considered a disadvantage in only 17.7 percent of the cases. One would imagine that financing the interinstitutional cooperative arrangement would be a more significant factor than it turns out to be in this instance.

It is evident that the interinstitutional arrangements are having positive effects on the private two-year colleges by the fact that they mention nearly five times as many advantages than disadvantages. This certainly enhances the argument that there is more to be gained than lost from interinstitutional cooperation and that cooperative ventures are an important way to gain advantages not only for students but for the institutions themselves.

State of Development

The survey attempted to determine the "state of development" for each program (Table 8). We wanted to know if the program was in a planning phase, if there was institutional commitment, or if there has been commitment and an ongoing program for a period of time. Information on 150 (72%) of the 207 interinstitutional cooperative programs revealed that the colleges have a "continuing commitment" to a vast majority (70.7%) of the programs, i.e., there has been commitment and they expect the program to continue. Another 16 percent of the programs are either in the "planning" or "beginning implementation" stages. Although the survey asked for information on current programs, a few of the colleges reported "completed" programs.

Again looking at public and private programs for stages of involvement, we see that the two are fairly equal in the combined areas of beginning implementation and continuing commitment. However, where the private sector reports 12 percent of their projects in the planning or pilot stages, the public sector indicates only 5 percent of the programs in these areas. Further, while private institutions have completed only 2 percent of their programs, the public sector indicates that 7 percent of the programs have been completed. This may indi-

TABLE 8

STATE OF DEVELOPMENT OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

STATE OF DEVELOPMENT	TOTAL NO. OF PROGRAMS RESPONDING*	PERCENTAGE
Planning	12	8.0
Pilot	6	4.0
Commitment	11	7.3
Begin Implementation	12	8.0
Continue Commitment	106	70.7
Completed	3	2.0
Total	150	100.0

*Seventy two and one half percent of the total number of programs responded to this question.

cate a more advanced state of the art as far as the public institutions are concerned, or earlier involvements.

Future Programs

Twenty-seven colleges responded to a question concerning possibilities for future interinstitutional cooperation and identified a total of 109 possible programs (Table 9).

TABLE 9

FUTURE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	TOTAL NO. OF FUTURE PROGRAMS	PERCENTAGE
Administrative & Business Services	13	11.9
Admissions & Enrollment	10	9.2
Academic	46	42.2
Library	6	5.5
Training	1	0.9
Student Services	19	17.4
Faculty	14	12.9
Total	109	100.0

The majority of projected cooperations, some 42 percent, fall in the area of academic programs. The second highest number of projected programs is in the student services area. Programs involving faculty programs and administrative and business concerns are almost

tied for third place with 14 and 13 programs respectively. There is almost no concern about cooperative training programs and very little concern about cooperative library programs, while in the public sector there is a 4 percent projected increase in training programs. The private sector showed a 2.5 percent decrease in the same area. This is in contrast to an absolute difference of 25 programs of future interinstitutional cooperation as reported by the private and public colleges. Both sectors report an equal amount of future academic programs (42%). The private sector, however, shows almost 10 percent more programs in the student services and faculty areas than does the public sector. Further, private colleges report almost 12 percent of their future programs to be in the area of administrative and business services, compared to only 6 percent in the same area as reported by the public institutions.

Strengths

Possible strengths which might be realized by future programs are indicated in Table 10. Of the 146 potential strengths which the colleges might bring to future programs, 41 percent of these are in the academic programs area, while student services and faculty strengths are shown at 17 percent and 16 percent respectively. Strengths which the colleges estimated they would bring to interinstitutional cooperative programs mainly cluster around personnel and physical plant, with instructional resources and recognized need or timeliness ranking third and fourth respectively.

Advantages

The colleges were asked to indicate how such future programs might help or be advantageous to the colleges. Responses to this question are indicated in Table 11.

The greatest number of potential advantages are envisioned in the academic programs area, with admissions and enrollment and faculty programs tied for second place. Library programs and training programs are certainly not major concerns for future interinstitutional programming. The potential advantages categories mentioned most frequently were curriculum and economizing measures, the two of them accounting for 70 percent of the possible advantages. This points to the private colleges' concern for expanding their curricular offerings

TABLE 10

STRENGTHS PROJECTED FOR FUTURE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	POTENTIAL STRENGTHS*								TOTAL NO. OF STRENGTHS	ROW PERCENTAGE
	PP	Eq	IR	RN	Pn	SS	Aut	EM		
Administrative & Business Services	2	1	1	2	4	–	–	2	12	8.2
Admissions & Enrollment	2	–	3	3	3	3	–	–	14	9.6
Academic	15	1	15	9	16	3	–	1	60	40.1
Library	3	–	2	1	2	–	–	–	8	5.5
Training	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	2	1.4
Student Services	9	–	3	5	8	1	–	–	26	17.8
Faculty	7	–	2	3	10	2	–	–	24	16.4
Total	38	2	26	23	43	11	–	3	146	100.0
Column Percentage	26.0	1.4	17.8	15.8	29.5	7.4	0.0	2.0	100.0	

*See Table 5 for key to abbreviations

TABLE 11

ADVANTAGES PROJECTED FOR FUTURE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	POTENTIAL ADVANTAGES*						TOTAL NO. OF ADVANTAGES	ROW PERCENTAGE
	Cm	EM	SS	AC	Fac	PP		
Administrative & Business Services	7	9	–	1	–	2	19	12.0
Admissions & Enrollment	7	9	4	3	1	1	25	15.8
Academic	24	19	7	6	3	6	65	41.1
Library	2	2	–	–	–	1	5	3.2
Training	–	–	1	–	–	–	1	0.7
Student Services	8	7	1	1	1	–	18	11.4
Faculty	7	10	4	1	3	–	25	15.8
Total	55	56	17	12	8	10	158	100.0
Column Percentage	34.8	35.4	10.8	7.6	5.1	6.3	100.0	

*Key to abbreviations:

Cm	Curriculum	AC	Administrative Considerations
EM	Economizing Measures	Fac	Faculty
SS	Student Services	PP	Physical Plant

and at the same time hoping to save more money. Because the quality of faculty in the independent colleges is often touted as one of the major characteristics of the institutions, it is unusual that in this survey there is little emphasis on faculty (and physical plant) as a possible advantage in any future interinstitutional arrangements.

Readiness for Involvement

The colleges were also asked to estimate their state of readiness for the various kinds of interinstitutional cooperation which they indicated as future possibilities.

Table 12 shows the distribution of responses to that question. Twenty-two colleges included information about the state of readiness for 47 possible future interinstitutional cooperative programs out of the total of 109 programs identified. The "colleges are ready" in 40 percent (nineteen) of the forty-seven future programs. They are "receptive to the idea" for such a program in 32 percent of the instances. Colleges are "ready to begin implementation" in 10 percent of the

TABLE 12

STATE OF READINESS OF FUTURE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

STATE OF READINESS	TOTAL NO. OF PROGRAMS RESPONDING*	PERCENTAGE
Receptive to the Idea	15	31.9
Planning	2	4.3
Pilot	–	0.0
Colleges Are Ready	19	40.4
Financial Considerations	6	12.8
Ready to Begin Implementation	5	10.6
Projected Expansion	–	0.0
Total	47	100.0

*Forty-three percent of the total programs responded to this question.

programs. However, the independent colleges have no "projected expansion" of existing programs nor do they have any "pilot" programs underway. Financial considerations are a factor in limiting possible future programs in only six instances, or about 13 percent of the projected programs.

Both the private and public sectors report about the same number of future programs (47 and 51 respectively). Although there were three times as many instances of receptivity to future interinstitutional cooperation in the private sector than in the public, the public sector far outruns the private in the areas of planning for future programs and projected expansion of present interinstitutional cooperative ventures. Financial considerations registered about the same for both sectors.

Some Notable Examples

To put a little meat on the statistical bones of the survey, let's look at some of the specific examples of interinstitutional cooperation now being conducted by the private two-year colleges.

There are a number of interesting bilateral arrangements. *Donnelly College* in Kansas City jointly shares computer facilities and services with Rockhurst College, a four-year private liberal arts college. *Westbrook College* in Maine provides the opportunity for a master's degree candidate at Columbia University's School of Dental Hygiene to work as an intern in Westbrook's Dental Hygiene Department. *Green Mountain College* in Vermont works with the University of

Vermont in a joint off-campus program, the Vermont Overseas Program, whereby selected students from Green Mountain spend the junior year abroad and then return to the University for their senior year and the bachelor's degree. *Hesston College* in Kansas uses the WATS line of a local corporation to aid with student and faculty recruiting. A number of instances of cross registration could be cited, but that of *Ohio Valley College* with Parkersburg Community College in West Virginia is a good example of private/public cooperation. By formal agreement with George Washington University in Washington, D.C., the *American College in Paris* accepts a group of selected GW students for a "Sophomore Year in Paris." And, in turn, GW guarantees places to transfer students from ACP who have an average of C or above. Students at *Kendall College* in Illinois can register for academic credit in any of the regularly scheduled courses at the Evanston Art Center. Graduate students at East Carolina University who plan to teach junior college physics can intern at *Chowan College*. *Mount Aloysius Junior College* cooperates with Indiana University of Pennsylvania in an associate degree program in criminology: thirty credits in criminology are offered by IUP, 36 credits in general education by MAJC; all course are taught on the MAJC campus and MAJC awards the degree.

Some of the more outstanding consortium arrangements involving three or more institutions include: *Donnelly College's* involvement in the 18-campus Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, one of the major consortia of national reputation; the Northeast Region of Colleges and Universities which includes *Maria College* in Albany, N.Y., as well as eight hospitals, seven community colleges, SUNY/Albany, seven four-year institutions, a medical college, and a law school; and *Green Mountain College* in Vermont has been involved with 14 other private two-year colleges in New England in joint recruiting, publishing a common brochure, and often visiting high schools together. There are a number of multi-institution library consortia, of which the Delaware Rapid Interlibrary Loan Project, in which *Wesley College* is involved, is a good example. This project attempts to improve library service throughout the state. *Villa Maria College* of Buffalo is a member of the Western New York Consortium of Higher Education which consists of 17 two- and four-year private and public colleges and universities. *Montreat-Anderson College* in North Carolina has served as coordinator of the Western Carolinas Junior College Consortium composed of 19 private and public two-year institutions

funded with Title III money. *Cullman College* in Alabama is involved in the Rural Junior College Development Consortium, consisting of two private and four public two-year colleges and funded with Title III money. The Kentucky Consortium of Colleges, including St. Catharine, Southeastern Christian, and Sue Bennett (all two-year private colleges) and Henderson Community College, has been operating for four years to bring about instructional improvement, especially in individualized instruction and learning how to make maximum use of Learning Resources Centers. We can also point to the Consortium of Tennessee Private Junior Colleges, funded again with Title III funds, which includes six private junior colleges. Finally, an interesting program is at work at *Ferrum College* in Virginia. The college is part of the Blue Ridge Parkway Cooperative involving cooperation among the Franklin County Board of Supervisors, Parkways officials, and the Community-Action-Craft Center in use of the 1,000-acre Parkway Environmental Center.

The Public Community College Perspective

In the spring of 1973, officials in 48 states, including all the members of the National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges, were asked to respond to a "survey of involvement in and readiness for interinstitutional cooperation" for all two-year public colleges within their respective jurisdictions. Usable information about the interinstitutional cooperation involving public two-year colleges was received from 21 state directors (Table 13). (One state submitted data too late to be included in the tabulation.) In addition, responses containing data insufficient for tabulation or indications of no ongoing projects were received from five additional states. In all, 328 programs, involving 321 public two-year colleges and 34 private two-year colleges, were reported. This averages to 0.9 programs per college.

Responding states included two with the largest systems of two-year colleges, namely California and New York. The Rocky Mountain Region showed the highest percentage response with 80 percent, followed by the Pacific Coast (75 percent), and the South (54 percent; Table 13). Some other states with extensive community college systems did not respond. No attempt has been made to extrapolate interinstitutional cooperation on a national scale from these data. The

TABLE 13

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS FOR PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES BY REGION

REGION	NO. OF STATES CONTACTED	NO. OF STATES RESPONDING	TYPE OF PROGRAM							TOTAL PROGRAMS IN EACH REGION
			AB	AE	Ac	Lb	Tr	SS	Fc	
Pacific Coast and Far West Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho,* Nevada, Oregon, Washington	8	6	3	5	32	3	2	4	0	49
Rocky Mountain Colorado, Montana,* New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming*	5	4	2	3	6	1	0	0	1	13
North Central Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin	13	5	2	1	9	1	3	1	0	17
South and Southeast Alabama,* Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana,* Mississippi,* Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia	13	7	5	3	30	2	12	3	3	58
Mid-Atlantic Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania	6	2	7	33	67	9	26	15	7	164
New England Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont	6	2	2	1	16	2	3	1	2	27
Total	48	26†	21	46	160	18	46	24	13	328

*Some interstate cooperative programs were reported. These are: (1) Gulf Regional Interstate Collegiate Consortium: Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi; (2) Southeast Consortium: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Texas; (3) College Student Exchange Program: Idaho, Montana, Washington.

†Of the 26 state directors responding, only 21 reported usable information.

assumption must be made, however, that many more cooperative programs exist than are herein described.

Geographic Distribution

The geographic spread of the responding states is national (see Table 13). The number of programs per state varied from one to 162, the latter being the contribution of New York. The Middle Atlantic Region showed the greatest number of interinstitutional cooperative programs, but the programs in this region were almost all in New York state. The South and Southeast Region reported the next greatest number of programs. The Pacific Coast Region was next with 49, followed by the Northeast with 27.

Responses

The state directors in the 21 states returning usable responses reported a total of 328 such programs of interinstitutional cooperation, among public institutions. In almost all cases these involved one or more public two-year colleges. Content analysis of the survey returns produced the totals in Table 14. Academic programs accounted for approximately half (160) of the 328 programs listed, with a tie for second place between training and admissions and enrollment programs (46 each).

TABLE 14

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS FOR PUBLIC TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

TYPE OF PROGRAM	NO. OF PROGRAMS	ROW PERCENTAGE
Administrative & Business Services	21	6.7
Admissions & Enrollment	46	13.2
Academic	160	48.5
Library	18	5.5
Training	46	14.4
Student Services	24	7.7
Faculty	13	4.0
Total	328	100.0

Educational Resources Utilized

Cooperative arrangements are initiated by or based at a higher education institution which uses many of the institutions and facilities throughout a state that were thought to have a "singular" function, *sui generis*. These become important educational resources and multifunctional when used as a partner in interinstitutional cooperation. State directors were asked to indicate what postsecondary, secondary, or community educational resources (such as specific colleges, universities, hospitals, museums, libraries, businesses and industries, proprietary schools, etc.) participated in each cooperative arrangement reported. Tables 15 and 16 display their responses.

Administrative and Business Services. Public community colleges were involved in 20 of the 21 administrative and business services programs. Next most frequently involved in this type of interinstitutional cooperation were the public four-year colleges, in a total of 13 programs. Private four-year colleges were more frequent participants than private two-year colleges, with respective participation in eight and six of these programs.

Admissions and Enrollment. All of the 46 admissions and enrollment programs reported by state directors involved public community colleges. More than half of that number (25 programs) cited interinstitutional cooperation with public four-year colleges. Private two-year colleges were named as participants in only two programs described by the state directors.

Academic Programs. All of the 160 academic programs of interinstitutional cooperation listed by the state directors involved one or more public community colleges. Public four-year colleges were included in about half of this number (76 programs). Next most frequent participants were the private four-year colleges, with 47 programs. Community resources mentioned included TV networks, libraries, hospitals, nursing homes, museums, civic centers, historical sites, military bases, penal institutions, elementary schools, musical groups, urban centers, and others. Educational resources of private two-year colleges, business and industry, and governmental offices (federal, state, local, and quasi-governmental) show a rough tie for fourth place with respect to cooperation in academic programs. These three types of educational resources are included in 13, 14, and 11 projects, respectively.

TABLE 15

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES USED IN COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES*										TOTAL NO. OF RESOURCES	ROW PERCENTAGE
	Pub Sec	Pr Sec	Pub 2 yr	Pr 2 yr	Pub 4 yr	Pr 4 yr	Prop	B&I	CR	Govt		
Administrative & Business Services	3	2	20	6	13	8	1	2	5	2	62	8.0
Admissions & Enrollment	4	0	43	2	25	19	1	2	1	6	103	13.0
Academic	2	0	158	13	76	47	1	14	11	30	352	46.0
Library	0	0	17	4	13	10	0	3	0	10	57	7.0
Training	5	5	45	4	19	8	2	7	4	12	111	14.0
Student Services	3	1	25	2	12	10	0	1	2	0	56	7.0
Faculty	0	0	13	3	4	5	0	1	0	2	28	4.0
Total	17	8	321	34	162	107	5	30	23	62	769	99.0†
Column Percentage	2.0	1.0	42.0	4.0	21.0	14.0	0.7	4.0	3.0	8.0	99.7†	

*See Table 3 for key to resource abbreviations.
†Percentages do not add to 100.0 due to rounding.

Library Programs. Most of the cooperative library projects involving public community colleges also included public four-year colleges, i.e., 13 out of the total of 18 programs in this category. Both private four-year colleges and community resources were included in 10 projects each. Only four of the reported interinstitutioanl library programs included private two-year colleges.

Student Services. The state directors reported 24 cooperative programs featuring student services, all of which included public two-year colleges. Over a third of these programs also included public or private four-year colleges, with these types of educational resources being involved in 12 and 10 projects, respectively. Only two of these projects focusing on student services included private two-year colleges among the participants.

Faculty Programs. The state directors reported 13 projects focused on faculty, and each included one or more community colleges as an educational resource. In contrast with some of the other program types, only about a third of the programs included educational resources other than public two-year colleges. Private four-year colleges, public four-year colleges, and private two-year colleges were included in five, four, and three projects, respectively.

Summary: Educational Resources. Table 15 shows the categories of cooperative programs, with the number of programs reported for each category, and the number of all types of educational resources found associated with each category. The columns to the far right list the frequency counts for the types of educational resources reported for each of the program categories. For example, the interinstitutional program category of administrative and business services showed a total of 62 educational resources, of which three were public high schools, two private high schools, 20 public two-year colleges, six private two-year colleges, and so on.

As shown across the bottom or total line, the 328 interinstitutional cooperative programs reported by the state directors involved a total of 769 recognized educational resources. (Public two-year colleges were included in 321 of the 328 programs cited.) The second most frequent involvement was for public four-year colleges (162 programs), and in third place were the private four-year colleges (107 programs). Only about one tenth of the interinstitutional co-

TABLE 16

COMMUNITY RESOURCES USED IN COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	COMMUNITY RESOURCES*																TOTAL	ROW PERCENTAGE
	TV	Lb	NS	Hp	Ms	MB	Pnl	EtS	Or	UC	HRA	NASA	HS	BdE	RO	Bk		
A&B	–	–	–	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	3.0
A&E	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	3	–	–	–	–	10	14.0
Ac	3	–	2	8	5	2	1	2	1	4	1	1	–	–	–	1	31	45.0
Lb	–	10	–	1	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	13	19.0
Tr	–	–	1	6	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	1	1	–	–	–	11	16.0
SS	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.0
Fc	–	–	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	3.0
Total	3	10	3	16	11	3	2	2	1	6	2	5	1	3	0	1	69	100.0
Column Percentage	4.0	14.0	4.0	23.0	16.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.5	9.0	3.0	7.0	1.5	4.0	0.0	1.5	98.5	

NOTE: Discrepancies in totals arise due to more than one activity per program or no indication of a given activity for a program.

*Key to Abbreviations:

TV	TV networks	MB	Military bases	NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Lb	Libraries	Pnl	Penal institutions	HS	Head Start
NS	Not stated – to be used as needed	EtS	Elementary schools	BdE	City Board of Education
Hp	Hospitals, nursing homes, etc.	Or	Bands, choirs, orchestras, etc.	RO	Religious organizations
Ms	Museums, civic centers, historical places, etc.	UC	Urban centers	Bk	Banks
		HRA	Human resources administration		

operative projects involving public two-year colleges (321 programs) also included private two-year colleges (33 programs).

Community Resources. Cooperative programs are using resources other than those directly educational and educationally related. Of the fifteen indicated in Table 16, the majority are used in the dominant type of program—the academic program. These programs use primarily hospitals and museums (and related types of sources). A few use urban centers. The library programs use community libraries.

Numbers of Educational Resources Used

Ten types of educational resources were reported by the state directors returning the survey. As may be seen there, only the administration and business services programs showed as many as seven out of the possible 10 categories of educational resources reported. Five or six types of educational resources were included in several of the other program categories.

TABLE 17

NUMBER OF EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES USED IN COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

	NUMBER OF EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES USED						
TYPE OF PROGRAM	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Administrative & Business Services	1	2	0	2	5	(7)*	4
Admissions & Enrollment	0	1	0	3	9	(30)	3
Academic	0	3	2	8	25	(98)	24
Library	0	1	2	4	(5)	4	2
Training	0	0	3	4	8	(27)	4
Student Services	0	0	0	2	7	(11)	4
Faculty	0	1	0	0	1	(8)	3

*The numbers circled are the modal number of educational resources for each program category.

The modal numbers of types of educational resources listed for the respective program categories are circled on Table 17. For example, one program listed under administrative and business services involved seven different types of educational resources from the list of 10 possible types of educational resources found in Table 15. Two of the projects in this category involved six types of educational re-

sources, and so on across the row for administrative and business services projects. The modal number of educational resources used in administrative and business services projects is two; i.e., the most frequently occurring number of resources is two. In this particular case, seven of the 21 programs used two types of educational resources.

For all but one of the program categories, i.e., library programs, the mode is two. Further, as the data in Table 17 show, these resources are most often the public two-year college and the public four-year college as the partners in a specific program of interinstitutional cooperation.

Each of the program categories included some examples involving only public community colleges. These appear in Table 17 as entries in the "1" column. For example, four administrative and business services projects included only public two-year colleges, as did 23 of the academic programs. Information about the precise educational resources—most of which are other institutional resources—was not requested by the survey instrument. Nevertheless, the responding state directors included these data in many instances. From the information available it appears that the numbers of institutions—as compared with educational resources—participating in a given project varied according to the state and its demographic and educational characteristics, the category of cooperative program, and the range of educational resources involved in a specific project.

Range of Involvement Within a State

The most common partners in ventures of interinstitutional cooperation are the public two-year and four-year colleges. Available data indicate, however, that this type of cooperative pattern tends to be less than statewide (Table 18).

A total of 162 programs of interinstitutional cooperation involving both two- and four-year public institutions was reported by the state directors responding to the survey. Eighty-two of these projects include other educational resources as well. Of the 162 program total, 17 were "public-inclusive": they were solely comprised of all of the two- and four-year public institutions in the respective states. Sixty-three of the remaining 145 programs were "public bilateral": they included only one two- and four-year public college. The other 82 programs of interinstitutional cooperation in this set were "multilateral": they included more than two educational resources; i.e.,

TABLE 18

PATTERNS OF COOPERATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

	BILATERAL PROGRAM (involves only two institutions)	MULTILATERAL PROGRAM (involves more than two educational resources or institutions)	TOTAL
Public-Inclusive Pattern Includes all two- and four-year public institutions within state	Not applicable	17	17
Public-Expansive Pattern Includes some two- and four-year public institutions within state either solely or in conjunction with other educational resources	63	82	145
Total	63	99	162

one or more than one public two-year college and one or more than one public four-year college or additional educational resources or institutions (Table 18).

Each of the seven program categories constitutes a given proportion of the total number of programs reported by the state directors. Table 19 shows these percentages, for the total number of programs and for the bilateral programs.

In the absence of any other standard of determining similarities or differences in bilateral versus multilateral programs, the assumption

TABLE 19

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PROGRAMS AND BILATERAL PROGRAMS IN EACH CATEGORY

TYPE OF PROGRAM	ALL REPORTED PROGRAMS	BILATERAL PROGRAMS
Admissions & Business Services	6.7	6.4
Admissions & Enrollment	13.2	19.0
Academic	48.5	47.6
Library	5.5	3.2
Training	14.4	19.0
Student Services	7.7	1.6
Faculty	4.0	3.2
Total	100.0	100.0

is made that the percentage of programs in any one category will be about equal to the percentage of bilateral programs in that category. The percentages given in Table 19 show that this assumption roughly holds true for administrative and business services, academic programs, library programs, and faculty programs. Both admissions and enrollment and training programs have a greater proportion of bilateral programs than total programs. Student services tend in the other direction; they account for only 1.6 percent of the bilateral programs, while they represent 7.7 percent of the total programs.

Strengths Contributed to Cooperative Programs

One of the major reasons for developing an interinstitutional cooperative program is that one or more of the institutions can make a whole which is stronger than its individual components. For each cooperative program reported, the state directors were asked to enumerate the strengths or unique elements which respective participants bring to the particular project. Respondents indicated a variety of strengths which were grouped into the following categories: physical plant, equipment, instructional resources, recognized need or timeliness (being able to implement a program "whose time has come"), personnel, student services, autonomy, and economizing measures.

Strengths were more often reported in conjunction with academic programs, where a total of 166 were actually mentioned. (This concentration of listings is to be expected, of course, since this category of interinstitutional cooperation contains the largest number of projects.) As may be seen in Table 20, the greatest number of strengths (44) were related to recognized need or timeliness. Instructional resources and personnel were also recognized as important strengths in relation to academic programs. Recognized need or timeliness and personnel were virtually tied as the most frequently mentioned strength for all types of programs. Out of a total of 328 programs, 70 cited timeliness and 69 cited personnel. Instructional resources was another overall strength with 53 citations.

A further content analysis of the strength category of "recognized need or timeliness" has been made in relation to academic programs, where it appeared as the most frequently mentioned strength. In those programs, overcoming geographic remoteness was most often cited as a strength for specific academic programs involving interinstitutional cooperation. Next most frequently noted strengths in this

TABLE 20

STRENGTHS CONTRIBUTED TO COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	STRENGTHS								TOTAL NO. OF STRENGTHS	ROW PERCENTAGE
	PP	Eq	IR	RN	Pn	SS	Aut	EM		
Administrative & Business Services	–	7	–	4	5	–	–	1	17	6.0
Admissions & Enrollment	–	–	4	11	2	–	–	–	17	6.0
Academic	16	12	32	44	31	20	1	10	166	57.0
Library	10	1	2	–	2	–	–	–	15	5.0
Training	3	2	7	7	19	9	1	2	50	17.0
Student Services	2	–	3	3	4	5	–	–	17	6.0
Faculty	–	–	3	1	6	–	–	–	10	3.0
Total	31	22	51	70	69	34	2	13	292	100.0
Column Percentage	11.0	8.0	17.0	24.0	24.0	12.0	0.7	4.0	100.7*	

*Percentages do not add to 100.0 due to rounding.

category were geographic proximity (possibility of cooperating with nearby institutions) and community involvement. Others mentioned at least once were: management systems, student transfer services, student counseling services, working student services, interinstitutional understanding, program problem articulation, consistency of requirements, merger of institutions, and high school diploma equivalency courses.

Economizing measures were mentioned as strengths in connection with only 13 out of the 328 programs, and almost all of these occurred in conjunction with academic programs. Specific types of economies included economies in purchasing, program offerings, student costs, and program cost.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Programs

Probably the main reason for entering into a cooperative arrangement is to share in the accrued benefits. As evidenced by the tables in this report, there were one-third more advantages recognized than the total number of interinstitutional cooperative projects. It is also important to state that for any given project each institution may admit more than one advantage. Also, any one institution may admit advantages for the same project different from any other institution cooperating in the program.

Where the institution benefited most by the recognized need to cooperate, service to students was the most frequently recognized advantage accruing to the colleges from programs of interinstitutional cooperation. Included in this advantage category are items such as greater accessibility of courses, continuing education counseling and orientation, tutoring and counseling, educational opportunity, transfer orientation, extracurricular programs, work experience, career training, and health care.

The next most frequently mentioned advantage was academic management, which included such items as calendar arrangements, instructional resource utilization, and uniformity of requirements. These were best seen as a combination of student and institutional advantages as explained by the state directors. Also frequently mentioned were administrative management items (purchasing, coordinated planning and decision making, conferences, data collection and dissemination); and economic considerations (program costs, staffing costs, supply costs; see Table 21). It appears that economic considerations are re-

TABLE 21

ADVANTAGES OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	ADVANTAGES								TOTAL NO. OF ADVANTAGES	ROW PERCENTAGE
	FR	AcM	AdM	EM	FS	PP	SS	Misc		
Administrative & Business Services	–	1	10	9	–	1	–	–	21	5.0
Admissions & Enrollment	1	9	1	3	–	–	5	3	22	5.0
Academic	14	64	39	42	6	9	78	1	253	60.0
Library	–	1	3	9	–	10	1	–	24	6.0
Training	2	14	15	5	4	1	21	–	62	15.0
Student Services	–	5	4	2	–	1	6	–	18	4.0
Faculty	8	2	5	2	3	–	–	–	20	5.0
Total	25	96	77	72	13	22	111	4	420	100.0
Column Percentage	6.0	23.0	18.0	17.0	3.0	5.0	26.0	1.0	99.0*	

*Percentages do not add to 100.0 due to rounding

garded as a definite advantage in programs of interinstitutional cooperation. At the same time, as seen in Table 20, the similar category of economizing measures was not cited as a particular strength of such programs. This may reflect the difference between aspiration (strength) and achievement (advantage). Faculty resources, physical plant, and fiscal support were all rated low as advantages.

While a total of 420 advantages was noted by the 328 respondents, only 59 disadvantages were cited. (This total was too low and the categories too simple to require tabular explanation.) The largest number of these disadvantages occurred in conjunction with academic programs, again to be expected since the greatest number of programs may be found in this category of interinstitutional cooperation. Overall, the most frequently mentioned disadvantage was coordination, which included items such as scheduling and programming; standardization of material; distance, travel, and communication; size of institution (inadequate capacity for program); articulation between institutions for students attending more than one institution; and lack of personnel for monitoring program.

The category of finances was noted as a disadvantage with only two projects, one an academic program, and the other a training program. This category included items such as cost of payment or who pays; overdependence on external sources; and noncompensation for work.

State of Development

Programs of interinstitutional cooperation reported their degree of development: planning, pilot, commitment, beginning implementation, continuing commitment, and completed.

As may be seen in Table 22, an overwhelming majority of the responses (for 227 out of 328 programs) indicated a continuing commitment to the program or to the concept of interinstitutional cooperation. A handful of programs were reported in the planning or pilot stages, with a somewhat larger number (a total of 44) in the commitment or beginning implementation stages. Twenty-two programs were reported as completed, i.e., they had run the course of the cooperation planned.

As mentioned earlier, there are probably more cases of interinstitutional cooperation that were not reported—possibly because

TABLE 22

STATE OF DEVELOPMENT OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

STATE OF DEVELOPMENT	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS RESPONDING*	PERCENTAGE
Planning	13	4.0
Pilot	3	1.0
Commitment	33	11.0
Begin Implementation	11	4.0
Continued Implementation	227	73.0
Completed	22	7.0
Total	309	100.0

*Ninety-four percent (309) of the total number of programs (328) responded to this question.

they were not thought of in the interinstitutional context or were felt to be too insignificant.

Future Programs

As future plans often provide the bases for later efforts, state directors were asked to repond to this question: "Were there resources to provide assistance to a group of institutions, which types of cooperative programs would be most appropriate for one or more colleges within your jurisdiction?" Only 13 state directors responded to this portion of the survey, together identifying a total of 83 possible future programs of interinstitutional cooperation. Of these, 35 were academic programs, 15 were training programs, and 11 were faculty programs. This distribution pattern appears to reflect the current concern with staff development.

Strengths Projected

Table 23 displays the possible strengths to be contributed to these future programs.

In contrast to present "strengths," the category of instructional resources was mentioned most often as a possible future strength. Included were items such as television, video tape, prepared programs, library resources, and radio programming. Recognized need or timeliness, and services to students tied for second place as the most frequently mentioned potential strengths of future cooperative programs.

TABLE 23

STRENGTHS PROJECTED FOR FUTURE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	STRENGTHS								TOTAL NO. OF STRENGTHS	ROW PERCENTAGE
	PP	Eq	IR	RN	Pn	SS	Aut	EM		
Administrative & Business Services	–	1	–	1	1	–	–	–	3	4.0
Admissions & Enrollment	–	–	2	4	–	–	–	–	6	9.0
Academic	2	3	7	4	2	–	–	2	20	29.0
Library	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	3.0
Training	3	1	9	1	4	10	–	–	28	41.0
Student Services	–	–	1	2	1	1	–	–	5	7.0
Faculty	–	2	2	–	–	1	–	–	5	7.0
Total	7	7	21	12	8	12	–	2	69	100.0
Column Percentage	10.0	10.0	30.0	17.0	12.0	17.0	0.0	3.0	99.0*	

*Percentages do not add to 100.0 due to rounding.

Of the 69 potential strengths listed for future programs, the respondents projected 20 of these for the academic programs, but slightly more (28) for the training programs. Referring back to Table 20, it may be seen that among current cooperative programs the academic program category holds the clear lead, with 160 out of 328 projects (48.5%) while the training programs category accounts for 46, or 14.4 percent of the total projects. With respect to current programs, the number of strengths attributed to training programs are in rough proportion to their representation in the total number of projects. In terms of future projects, however, more strengths are projected for training programs than for the omnipresent academic programs.

Advantages

Advantages envisioned by the state directors for future projects of interinstitutional cooperation are shown in Table 24.

The greatest number of potential advantages were attributed to academic programs, with second place going to training programs. The potential advantage category most frequently mentioned overall was that of curriculum improvement, which includes items such as extended course offerings, providing new educational outlets, improving existing programs, better use of resources, and computer programs and instructional resources.

Services to students were also listed as potential advantages resulting from the future programs of interinstitutional cooperation suggested by the responding state directors. A third advantage of some prominence concerns the area of articulation/communication, which includes items such as awareness of programs and problems at other institutions, better programming, community relations, general administration and statistical records, and joint planning. Economic considerations did not rank high in the projected advantages of the suggested types of interinstitutional cooperation.

Readiness for Involvement

State directors were asked to estimate institutional readiness for the specific type of interinstitutional cooperation suggested for future implementation. Table 25 shows the distribution of their responses.

TABLE 24

ADVANTAGES PROJECTED FOR FUTURE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

TYPE OF PROGRAM	ADVANTAGES*						TOTAL NO. OF ADVANTAGES	ROW PERCENTAGE
	Cm	EM	SS	AC	Fac	PP		
Administrative & Business Services	2	–	–	1	–	–	3	5.0
Admissions & Enrollment	2	–	2	1	–	–	5	9.0
Academic	11	5	4	2	–	–	22	38.0
Library	–	–	1	–	–	2	3	5.0
Training	1	–	3	5	2	–	11	19.0
Student Services	4	–	2	–	–	–	6	10.0
Faculty	1	–	1	1	5	–	8	14.0
Total	21	5	13	10	7	2	58	100.0
Column Percentage	36.0	9.0	22.0	17.0	12.0	3.0	99.0†	

*See Table 11 for key to abbreviations.
†Percentages do not add to 100.0 due to rounding.

TABLE 25

STATE OF READINESS OF FUTURE COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

STATE OF READINESS	NO. OF PROGRAMS RESPONDING*	PERCENTAGE
Receptive to the Idea	5	10.0
Planning	8	16.0
Pilot Stage	1	2.0
Colleges Ready	15	31.0
Financial Consideration	7	14.0
Ready to Begin Implementation	7	14.0
Projected Expansion	6	12.0
Total	49	99.0†

*Fifty percent of the total number of future programs (83) responded to this question.
†Percentages do not add to 100.0 due to rounding.

Eighty-three programs were projected: of these, 51 included information about the state of readiness.

The most frequent (modal) response to this question of readiness (15 responses) showed that "the colleges are ready." Another eight future projects were reported as being in the planning stages and an additional seven were ready to begin implementation. Financial considerations appear to have been a factor limiting readiness in seven of the projected programs.

Summary and Discussion of Survey Findings

Of the 180 independent two-year colleges with membership in AACJC in 1973 (the year of the survey), 45 reported 207 programs of interinstitutional cooperation; of the 686 public two-year colleges which were members of AACJC in that same year, 321 reported a total of 328 programs. This means that about 25 percent of the AACJC independent membership have cooperative programs while 50 percent of the public colleges have such programs. Or, to look at the numbers in a different way, 20 percent of the total 231 independents and about 30 percent of the total 910 public colleges have such programs. Since it appears that most of the cooperative interinstitutional programs have begun only in the last five years, the percentages of the AACJC membership with such programs is hopeful, but continues to pose the question: How can more of the private colleges be brought into such programs, especially programs carrying a continuing commitment? What can be done to stimulate further cooperation along lines of the notable examples this study identified? The private institutions average 4.0 programs per reporting institution; the public colleges 0.9 programs per institution; this reflects the fact that relatively few of the private colleges have become involved but those that have are quite active and that the generalization on this point is just the opposite for the public colleges.

For both types of institutions, approximately 50 percent of all programs are academic. Library, faculty, and admissions and enrollment programs comprised other important program areas for the independents, with a total of 33 percent of the remaining programs. Training and admissions and enrollment programs are the other important areas for the public institutions. Apparently the private colleges move to augment instructional services and related resources, while the public colleges concentrate on augmenting the curriculum. This suggests that more cooperative arrangements might be formulated to permit the instructional strengths of private colleges to reinforce the growing comprehensive offerings of the public colleges. Services to students as yet are not a strong major emphasis.

Public programs are primarily multilateral; independent programs, primarily bilateral. This is not surprising, considering the greater number of such institutions and the fact that most public community colleges are or see themselves as a part of a larger system. Which type

of arrangement is more desirable? What are the problems of each type? Questions such as these were beyond the scope of this study but merit more attention and examination.

In regard to who cooperates with whom, the independents tend to cooperate with the independents; the public colleges with other publics. They cooperate first with their two-year counterpart then with their four-year counterpart. These findings suggest both a need and a challenge to agencies, associations, and the colleges themselves for better communication linkages. The AACJC and the Council of Independent Colleges need especially to note this point.

Of the strengths contributed by the various institutions, about 50 percent are for academic programs. These strengths are instructional resources, personnel, and timeliness for the independents; for the public colleges they are timeliness, personnel, and instructional resources. Thus, the strengths are the same for both types of institutions, but in a different order of priority. Independents have an average of two strengths per program; public colleges, 0.9 strengths.

Cooperation appears to bring more advantages than disadvantages. For the independents, these are in the area of student services and economic measures; for the public colleges, they are also student services and academic and administrative management. Fifty percent of the advantages lie in the academic programs. The major disadvantage reported for each type of institution is the complication surrounding coordination of the cooperative programs.

Programs projected for the future, as would be expected, are primarily academic for both types of institutions. For independents, student services, faculty programs, and administrative and business programs are also important; for public colleges, training programs and faculty programs are those to be developed. In other words, the private colleges now are trying to develop services to students as a major goal of cooperation and they also wish to increase types of programs not now dominant, i.e., faculty and administrative and business programs. The public institutions intend to augment their training programs and to improve faculty.

Independents see future strengths in the augmentation of personnel and physical plant for their academic programs. Public colleges want to strengthen training and academic programs primarily by added instructional resources. Primary advantages for the independent institutions are thus to the curriculum and to economy; added instructional resources are the advantage to the public, with timeliness and student

services following. The independent institutions see a need to improve curriculum and to economize; the public colleges sense need for items of added instructional resources; that these are complimentary parts of a well-rounded academic service suggests again the gains that can accrue from an enhanced drive for more private and public two-year college interinstitutional cooperation.

Of the colleges envisioning such future programs, a large percentage are ready to begin (40 percent of the independents; 31 percent of the public colleges); private colleges reporting in the next largest category "receptive" came to another 32 percent, while 19 percent of the public colleges were in the more advanced stage "planning." There can be no doubt, then, that given a strong leadership effort by the AACJC and other interested and responsible parties, a greater interinstitutional effort among the community and junior colleges of the nation can be a positive reality. The question now is: What is needed to move ahead?

IV. MOVING AHEAD

The pictures of interinstitutional cooperation, actual and potential, provided by the private junior colleges and the state officials responsible for public community colleges, when viewed together, give several pointers for future action. Some are the result of positive conclusions emerging from the information they provided and discussed in this report; some result from the authors' examination and reflection on evident departures from what might have been expected from the surveys.

The authors assume that new plans will be laid by the AACJC, the Council of Independent Colleges, and others to bring the private college resources more demonstrably and operationally into a fuller utilization than now achieved to meet the nation's postsecondary educational needs. The contents of this report show that such action is timely and can produce substantial gains for the "community-junior college movement." By developing stronger and more pervasive interinstitutional arrangements, both the public community colleges and the independent junior colleges can be helped; but, more important, a greater and stronger service can be provided the total citizenry with highest efficiency in use of resources.

Despite the large body of literature relating to interinstitutional cooperation, there is still more talk than positive action actually taking place. Most of the states with large community college systems showed surprisingly few instances of interinstitutional cooperation. However, this does not negate the fact that the idea and, in some cases, its practice, does seem to be growing.

At this time, many of the cooperative efforts are multilateral in nature. They may be related to a "regionalism-type" concept and the fact that more types of resources organized and supported on a regional basis may more easily solve some postsecondary educational problems: the possibilities inherent in a strengthened effort to capitalize on regional characteristics, needs, and resources seem considerable. Geographic location—both in the public and private institutional surveys—was identified as a primary consideration for cooperation.

Another target for possible future attention is the college's concerns for interinstitutional efforts to improve instructional resources. Future interinstitutional cooperative arrangements will probably seek out and rely most heavily on resources internal to each co-

operating institution. Many two-year colleges, private as well as public, have strong elements in their instructional services. Due to the possible shortage of external funds for development, institutions will increasingly be expected and forced to use resources that are already available. These include the faculty and other professional personnel as well as the instructional hardware and software needed to support the expanding array of instructional programs. The colleges give evidence of readiness to act in these directions but also show need for consultative and other assistance to help get the needed action started.

Training programs to assist college personnel in this regard are obvious and are seen by the authors as of two types in the future. One is the needed staff development for personnel employed by the colleges as just noted; the other (strongly suggested in the survey results) is the use of personnel already in the community and junior colleges as agents for more widespread and diverse resources to develop better communities. The recent advancement in theories of life-long learning will put a heavy reliance on the continual in-service training for most professions and careers. To this end the development of expansive in-service training programs for all kinds of community groups (employed persons in many classifications of work as well as persons who seek enriched and more fulfilling leisure pursuits) will be of particular benefit to the sponsoring institution and to the entire community which that institution serves. This, as noted, also includes the in-service training of those who will teach others. The prospects for better total community education by greater interinstitutional cooperation are exciting and potentially momentous.

The moment for action toward more cooperative integration of private junior college resources is at hand. Both the private and public institutions covered in this study express a particular dynamism in interinstitutional cooperation, but the state of readiness shown by the private sector particularly indicates receptivity to the idea of interinstitutional cooperation. Leadership of the national associations representing them as well as that in the state agencies, private foundations, and in the individual colleges is challenged to a positive response in order that the opportunity of the moment will not be lost.

APPENDIX A

Planning Group Members

Representatives from:

Independent Two-Year Colleges

Scott A. Fisher, President
Fisher Junior College
118 Beacon Street
Boston, Mass. 02116

Sr. Eileen Farley
President
Elizabeth Seton College
Yonkers, N.Y. 10701

Larnie Horton
President
Kittrell College
Kittrell, N.C. 27544

Public Two-Year Colleges

William Strasser
President
Montgomery College
Rockville, Md. 20850

Joseph Rushing, Chancellor
Tarrant County Junior College District
1400 Fort Worth National Bank Building
Fort Worth, Tx. 76102

Public Sector*

Mervin Strickler, Chief
Aviation Education Program Division
800 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20591

Cameron West, Vice President
University of North Carolina
Box 307
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

Ex-officio

National Council of Independent Colleges

William S. Hayes -or-
President
Alice Lloyd College
Pippa Passes, Ky. 41844

Harry Miller -or-
President
Keystone Junior College
La Plume, Pa. 18440

Bruce Whitaker
President
Chowan College
Murfreesboro, N.C. 27850

Kenneth MacKay
23 Greenwood Avenue
Madison, N.J. 07914

Richard Witter, Director, NCIJC, AACJC
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

AACJC

Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. -or-
President, AACJC
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

William G. Shannon
Senior Vice President, AACJC
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Eileen Kuhns, Executive Associate for Council Development -or-
AACJC
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Howard Simmons, Staff Associate for Councils
AACJC
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

*Dr. Oliver Lane also represented the public sector at most Planning Group meetings.

APPENDIX B

Task Force—Independent/Public Colleges

S. V. Martorana, Chairman
Professor of Higher Education
Center for the Study of Higher Education
101 Rackley Building
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
814-865-6347

Donald Canar, President
Central YMCA Community College
211 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312-222-8210

Henry Chauncey, President
Interuniversity Communication Council, Inc.
P.O. Box 363
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
609-921-7575

Martha Church
Executive Associate Secretary
Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools
Gateway One, Plaza West
Newark, New Jersey 07102
201-622-5800

William Dwyer, President
Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges
177 Milk Street, #410
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
617-727-2876

Marie Y. Martin
Director of Community College Education
Bureau of Higher Education
United States Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202
202-963-7273

Lewis D. Patterson
Coordinator of Cooperative Programs
American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-293-6440

Richard Pickett, President
Northampton Junior College
Northampton, Massachusetts 01060
413-584-1754

Jeanette Poore, President
Everett Community College
801 Wetmore Avenue
Everett, Washington 98201
206-259-7151

Mervin Strickler
Chief, Aviation Education Programs Division
Federal Aviation Administration
800 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20591
202-426-3711

Granville K. Thompson
Coopers and Lybrand
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020
212-489-1100

References

Astin, Alexander W. and Lee, Calvin, B.T. *The Invisible Colleges.* Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: Mcgraw-Hill, 1972.

Commager, Henry S. "Has the Small College a Future?" *Saturday Review* 53 (21 February 1970): 62-64; 88-90.

Connor, Aikin. "The Private Junior College in 1971." *Junior College Journal* 42 (August 1971): 24-25.

Davis, Frampton. "Developing Colleges Through Interinstitutional Cooperation." *Educational Record* 48 (Fall 1967): 348-54.

Donovan, George F. "Philosophy of Interinstitutional Cooperation in American Higher Learning." *College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation.* Edited by George F. Donovan. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

Eddy, Edward D. "Will Private Colleges Survive the 70s?" *Independent School Bulletin* 32 (February 1973): 27-28.

Editorial. "An Era of Cooperation." *The Journal of Higher Education* 37 (January 1966): 38-40.

Five College Long Range Planning Committee. *Five College Cooperation: Directions for the Future.* Amherst, Massachusetts: Five Colleges, Inc., 1969.

Garrison, Roger H. "Private Junior Colleges: The Question is Survival." *Junior College Journal* 39 (March 1969): 35-38.

Geiger, Louis G. "The Impending Crisis of the Liberal Arts College." *AAUP Bulletin* 57 (December 1971): 500-4.

Gleason, Sr. Hilda, D.C. "Cooperation of Six Small Colleges in Non-Western Studies Program." *The Catholic Education Review* 61 (October 1963): 470-74.

Hughes, Clarence. "Individual Uniqueness: The Key to Survival for the Private College." *Peabody Journal of Education* 49 (April 1972): 241-44.

Jamrich, John X. "Interinstitutional Cooperation in Research and Instruction." *College and University* 40 (Fall 1964): 25-34.

Johnson, Eldon L. "College Federations." *The Journal of Higher Education* 37 (January 1966): 1-9.

———. "Consortia in Higher Education." *Educational Record* 48 (Fall 1967): 341-47.

Kinnison, William A. "Private Higher Education: Demise or Transition?" *Educational Record* 50 (Summer 1969): 267-73.

Kreplin, Hannah S. and Bolce, Jane W. *Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education: An Analysis and Critique.* Ford Foundation Program for Research in University Administration. Berkeley: University Press, October, 1973.

MacKay, Kenneth C. *The Private College Study: A Report to the American Association of Junior Colleges.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, May 1, 1968.

———. "The Private Junior College: Taking Inventory." *Junior College Journal* 39 (November 1968): 22-24.

Martorana, S. V.; Messersmith, James C.; and Nelson, Lawrence O. *Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities.* Washington, D.C.: USDHEW, 1961. Office of Education Circular No. 649.

Moore, Raymond S. *Consortiums in American Higher Education: 1965-66.* Washington, D.C.: USDHEW, OE, 1968.

Patterson, Lewis D. *Consortia in American Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1970. Report 7.

———. "The Potential of Consortia." *Compact* 5 (October 1971): 19-22.

Pray, Francis. "Higher Cost Private Colleges Must Make the Product Worth the Price." *College and University Business* 53 (July 1972): 20-24.

Proceedings. *Conference on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation.* Princeton: April 1962. Edited by John J. Wittich. Corning, New York: College of the Finger Lakes.

Raper, W. Burkette. "A Plan of Action for the Private Junior Colleges." *Junior College Journal* 39 (December 1968): 21-24.

Roueche, John E.; McFarlane, William H.; and Herscher, Barton R. *The Private Junior College: Prospects for the 70s.* National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971.

Salwak, Stanley F. "The Need for Cooperation and the C.I.C. Response." *Educational Record* 45 (Summer 1964): 308-16.

———. "New Patterns of Institutional Cooperation." *The Journal of Higher Education* 39 (December 1968): 490-96.

Sanford, Daniel S. *Interinstitutional Agreements in Higher Education.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934.

Smith, Arden K. "Our Stake in the Private Liberal Arts College." *Today's Education* 58 (March 1969): 51-52.

Stewart, Blair. "Interinstitution Cooperation." *North Central Association Quarterly* 40 (Winter 1966): 295-98.

U. S. Office of Education, *Trends in Postsecondary Education*, October 1970.

Wenberg, Stanley J. "Private Higher Education in America Today." *School and Society* 97 (November 1969): 439-41.

Wilson, Logan. "Current Changes in Education." *North Central Association Quarterly* 39 (Spring 1965): 312-17.

Wood, Herbert H. "Cooperation Among Institutions." *Liberal Education* 57 (May 1971): 242-51.

NOTES ON THE AUTHORS

S. V. Martorana is research associate at the Center for the Study of Higher Education and professor of higher education in the college of education at Penn State. Dr. Martorana has an M.A. and Ph.D. in education from the University of Chicago. Prior to his appointment at Penn State he served as vice chancellor for community colleges and provost for vocational and technical education at the State University of New York. Previously he has served in numerous administrative and policy-making capacities in higher education, particularly in the area of community colleges. He has published numerous books, monographs, and articles in these areas, among which are *College Boards of Trustees, The Laws Relating to Higher Education in the Fifty States* (with James L. Wattenbarger) and "Financing Community-Junior Colleges" in the *Encyclopedia of Education.*

Eileen P. Kuhns is executive associate for council development at AACJC. Dr. Kuhns has an M.A. and a Ph.D. in Sociology from Syracuse University. She has a wide variety of experience in higher education having served as professor of sociology, institutional researcher, and dean. Prior to her appointment at AACJC Dr. Kuhns served as vice president for academic affairs at Mt. Vernon College. She has published in both the areas of sociology and higher education, the CUPIR manuscript being her most recent contribution.

Richard M. Witter is director, National Council of Independent Junior Colleges, an affiliate organization of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. He has an M.A. from the American University in Washington, D.C. and is ABD in higher education administration from the Catholic University of America. Prior to his appointment at NCIJC he was assistant executive director of the Council for Advancement of Small Colleges, which plans and implements programs and services for over 100 small, private liberal arts colleges. Mr. Witter has served in numerous administrative posts relating to alumni, admissions, public relations, and development. He has published articles dealing with foundation support of higher education and aspects of financing private junior colleges.

Alan J. Sturtz is assistant to the president at Schenectady County Community College. Mr. Sturtz has an M.A. in history from Penn State, where he is a candidate for the D.Ed. degree in Higher Education. He has served as a research assistant to the dean of the graduate school and as a graduate assistant with the Center for the Study of Higher Education, both at Penn State. Mr. Sturtz is completing a dissertation concerning policy decision making interface between state coordinating boards for community colleges and community college boards of trustees.

Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

The Center for the Study of Higher Education was established in January 1969 to study higher education as an area of scholarly inquiry and research. Dr. G. Lester Anderson, its director, is aided by a staff of twenty, including five full-time researchers, and a cadre of advanced graduate students and supporting staff.

The Center's studies are designed to be relevant not only to the University and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but also to colleges and universities throughout the nation. The immediate focus of the Center's research falls into the broad areas of governance, graduate and professional education, and occupational programs in two-year colleges.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 28 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Research reports, monographs, and position papers prepared by staff members of the Center can be obtained on a limited basis. Inquiries should be addressed to the **Center for the Study of Higher Education, 101 Rackley Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 16802.**

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Monographs

Innovative Programs in Education for the Professions, Larry L. Leslie, June 1974.

Insights into Higher Education: Selected Writings of CSHE, 1969-73, Vol. III, Curriculum, Graduate and Professional Education, Finance, Winter 1974.

Insights into Higher Education: Selected Writings of CSHE, 1969-73, Vol. II, Community College and Postsecondary Occupational Education, Winter 1974.

Insights into Higher Education: Selected Writings of CSHE, 1969-73, Vol. I, Governance, Winter 1974.

Anatomy of a Collective Bargaining Election in Pennsylvania's State-Owned Colleges, G. Gregory Lozier and Kenneth P. Mortimer, February 1974.

Variability in Faculty Perception of the Legitimacy of Decision Making at Nine Pennsylvania Institutions, David W. Leslie, November 1973.

Institutional Self-Study at The Pennsylvania State University, Kenneth P. Mortimer and David W. Leslie (eds.), December 1971.

Human Services Occupations in the Two-Year College: A Handbook, Theodore E. Kiffer and Martha Burns, May 1972.

Numbered Reports

The Higher Education Faculty of Pennsylvania: Selected Characteristics, Larry L. Leslie and James Creasy, July 1974, Report No. 24.

The Comm-Bacc Study: Postbaccalaureate Activities of Degree Recipients from Pennsylvania Institutions 1971-72, William Toombs, August 1973, Report No. 23.

Students and Unions, Neil S. Bucklew, July 1973, Report No. 22.

Compensatory Education in Two-Year Colleges, James L. Morrison and Reynolds Ferrante, April 1973, Report No. 21.

Pennsylvania's "State-Owned" Institutions: Some Dimensions of Degree Output, William Toombs and Stephen D. Millman, February 1973, Report No. 20.

The Trend Toward Government Financing of Higher Education Through Students: Can the Market Model be Applied?, Larry L. Leslie, January 1973, Report No. 19. (Out of print.)

The Rationale for Various Plans for Funding American Higher Education, Larry L. Leslie, June 1972, Report No. 18.

Collective Bargaining: Implications for Governance, Kenneth P. Mortimer and G. Gregory Lozier, July 1972, Report No. 17.

Productivity and the Academy: The Current Condition, William Toombs, May 1972, Report No. 16. (Out of print.)

Exceptional Graduate Admissions at The Pennsylvania State University, Manuel G. Gunne and Larry L. Leslie, March 1972, Report No. 15.

The Quality of Graduate Studies: Pennsylvania and Selected States, Stephen D. Millman and William Toombs, February 1972, Report No. 14.

Reports 1–13 out of print.

Conference Reports

The Fifth Annual Pennsylvania Conference on Postsecondary Occupational Education, Angelo C. Gillie (ed.), June 1974.

The Fourth Annual Pennsylvania Conference on Postsecondary Occupational Education, Angelo C. Gillie (ed.), August 1973.

Bibliographies

The University and the Arts: A Preliminary Annotated Bibliography, Ann Kieffer Bragg, May 1974.

Selected Bibliography in Higher Education, September 1969; revised April 1972; revised August 1974.

Occasional Papers

Ann Kieffer Bragg and G. Lester Anderson, *Journals of Education for the Professions: A Preliminary Study*, May 1974.

Ralph L. Boyers in collaboration with Robert E. Sweitzer, *Collective Bargaining in Pennsylvania: A Summary of Collective Bargaining Agreements*, August 1973.

Naomi V. Ross, *Community College Teacher Preparation Programs in the U.S.: A Bibliography with Introductory Notes*, August 1972.